REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-10. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-10.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 3-4, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that claims 3-4, 8, and 10, as now more clearly recited, are in compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that claims 8 and 10, as now more clearly recited, are in compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,618,742 to Krum in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,429 to Sekijima, et al. ("Sekijima"). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10, are not taught or suggested by Krum or Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of

the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to An information processing system, a control method of an information processing system, and a program to calculate load data in an information processing system as recited, for example, in independent claims 1, 5-7 and 9.

Claims 1-4

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, provides an information processing system including an information processing apparatus that is used to operate a plurality of application to request data input to or data output from a storage. The system also includes a management host that manages the storage. According to the present invention, the storage and information processing apparatus constitute an access process section for processing an access request from the application, and the information processing apparatus includes an access monitoring section that monitors an access request for each of the applications. Also according to the present invention, the management host includes an acceptance section, and estimated load calculation section, and a load data output section. The acceptance section accepts specification of a new application. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of an addition of the new application based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. The load data output section outputs the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. The prior art does not teach or suggest all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly

recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Krum or Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Krum teaches a method for processing requests to service computational tasks. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Krum of the information processing system as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

In Krum's method for processing requests to service computational tasks, an application server system receives requests to run various jobs. A job indicates that a certain application program is to be executed with a certain set of input. The application server system includes a master computer and multiple slave computers. The master computer receives requests to run jobs, selects a slave computer to run each job, and then assigns each job to the slave computer selected for that job. The master computer of the application server system received the requests from client computers that may be connected to the application server system via the Internet. A client-side component of the application server system may execute on the client computers to assist users in submitting their requests.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, includes where the management host includes an estimated load calculation section. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of an addition of the new application based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Krum does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Krum discloses an estimated load calculation section, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 42-49 and

column 4, lines 8-19. The cited text describes a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, the estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data that is accessed from an application, if a new application is added. The claimed estimated amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose an estimate load calculation section, as claimed.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, includes where the management host includes a load data output section. The load data output section outputs the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Krum does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Krum for teaching a load data output section. Furthermore, as previously discussed, Krum does not teach an estimated load calculation section, as claimed. Therefore, it follows that Krum does not teach a load data output section that outputs estimated load data calculated by the estimated load calculation section.

Therefore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "an estimated load calculation section which calculates estimated amount of load data accessed from said application to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information obtained by said access monitoring section" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "a load data output section

which outputs the estimated amount of load data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 1.

The above noted deficiencies of Krum are not supplied by any of the other references of record, namely Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, combining the teachings of Krum and Sekijima in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Sekijima teaches a service processing apparatus and a service execution control method. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sekijima of the information processing system as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Sekijima discloses a list of applicable services that are dynamically updated and that enables users to specify selective combinations of the services. A client includes an input unit, a display unit, a user authentication unit, a service display and section unit, a document set display and display unit, and the like. The service display and selection unit create a list of currently active, applicable services and performs processing for a user's service selection. The document set display and selection unit creates a list of documents included in a document set specified by a user and performs processing of user's document selection. In the servers, a service management unit, a selected service execution unit, service providing units, a document information management unit, a document storage unit, and a user information management unit operate respectively.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, includes where the management host includes an estimated load calculation section. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data

accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of an addition of the new application based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching an estimated load calculation section. Furthermore, the "load" referred to in Sekijima reflects the server load status, which is an indication of server usage (see, e.g., column 3, lines 53-59). The claimed estimated amount of data is quite different from the amount of server resources being used in Sekijima. As such, Sekijima does not disclose an estimated load calculation section, as claimed.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, includes where the management host includes a load data output section. The load data output section outputs the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Sekijima discloses a load data output section, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 53-59. However, the cited text where server load status may be displayed. This is not the same as outputting an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section, as in the present invention. More specifically, the server load status of Sekijima, which is an indication of the amount of server resources used, is not the same as an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section, as claimed.

Therefore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "an estimated load calculation section which calculates estimated amount of load data accessed from said application to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information obtained by said access monitoring section" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "a load data output section which outputs the estimated amount of load data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6

The present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, provides an information processing system including a storage that stores a database, a plurality of information processing apparatuses that are used to operate an application requesting data input to or output from the storage, and a management host that manages the storage. According to the present invention, each of the information processing apparatuses includes a database management system that processes an access request from the application to the database, an access monitoring section that monitors an access request sent from the application to the data base management system and obtains information about the access request, and an access information output section that collection information about the access request and adds up the information correspondingly to the application. Also according to the present invention, the management host includes an acceptance section, a current load calculation section, an estimated load calculation section, a load data output section, and a configuration setup section. The acceptance section accepts specification of a new application. The current load calculation section calculates the current amount of data based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, calculated by the current load calculation section and based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. The load data

output section outputs an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. The configuration setup section sets up a change in configuration of the storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. The prior art does not teach or suggest all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Krum or Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Krum teaches a method for processing requests to service computational tasks. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in information processing system as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a current load calculation section. The current load calculation section calculates the current amount of data based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Krum does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Krum teaches a current load calculation section, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 42-49. As previously discussed, the cited text describes a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, the current load

calculation section calculates a current amount of data based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. The claimed current amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose an estimate load calculation section, as claimed.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes an estimated load calculation section. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, calculated by the current load calculation section and based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Krum does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Krum discloses an estimated load calculation section, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19. However, as previously discussed, the cited text describes a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, the estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data that is accessed from an application, calculated by the current load section and based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. The claimed estimated amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose an estimate load calculation section, as claimed.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as

similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a load data output section. The load data output section outputs an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Krum does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Krum for teaching this feature. Furthermore, as previously discussed, Krum does not teach an estimated load calculation section, as claimed. Therefore, it follows that Krum does not teach a load data output section that outputs estimated load data calculated by the estimated load calculation section.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a configuration setup section. The configuration setup section sets up a change in configuration of the storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Krum does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Krum discloses a configuration setup section, the Examiner cites column 2, lines 58-62 and column 4, lines 20-37. However, the cited text merely describes adding or removing slave computers as the demand for computing resources changes, and configuring slave computers such that only a certain number of instances of each application program can execute at the same time. In Krum, the change in configuration is based on the demand for computing resources. This basis for changing the configuration is quite different from changing the configuration of storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section, in the manner claim.

Therefore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "a current load calculation section which calculates current amount of data based on information obtained by said

access monitoring section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "an estimated load calculation section which calculates estimated amount of data accessed from said application to said storage, calculated by said current load calculation section and based on information obtained by said access monitoring section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Even further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "a load data output section which outputs estimated amount of data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Yet even further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "a configuration setup section which sets up a change in configuration of said storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

The above noted deficiencies of Krum are not supplied by any of the other references of record, namely Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, combining the teachings of Krum and Sekijima in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

As previously discussed, Sekijima teaches a service processing apparatus and a service execution control method. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sekijima of the information processing system as recited in claim 5 and as similarly recited in claim 6 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a current load

calculation section. The current load calculation section calculates the current amount of data based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching a current load calculation section.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes an estimated load calculation section. The estimated load calculation section calculates an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, calculated by the current load calculation section and based on information obtained by the access monitoring section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching an estimated load calculation section.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a load data output section. The load data output section outputs an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Sekijima discloses this feature, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 53-59. However, the cited text where server load status may be displayed. This is not the same as outputting an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section, as in the present invention. More specifically, the server load status of Sekijima, which is an indication of the amount of server resources used, is not the same as an estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section, as claimed.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 5, and

as similarly recited in claim 6, includes where the management host includes a configuration setup section. The configuration setup section sets up a change in configuration of the storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by the estimated load calculation section. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching a configuration setup section.

Therefore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "a current load calculation section which calculates current amount of data based on information obtained by said access monitoring section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "an estimated load calculation section which calculates estimated amount of data accessed from said application to said storage, calculated by said current load calculation section and based on information obtained by said access monitoring section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Even further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "a load data output section which outputs estimated amount of data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Yet even further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "a configuration setup section which sets up a change in configuration of said storage based on the estimated amount of data calculated by said estimated load calculation section" as recited in claim 5, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Claims 7 and 8

The present invention, as recited in claim 7, provides a control method of an

information processing system including an information processing apparatus that is used to operate a plurality of applications to request data input to or data output from a storage, and a management host that manages the storage. The method includes a step of monitoring an access request from each of the applications and obtaining information about the access request for each of the applications. The method also includes calculating the current amount of data accessed from each of the applications to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained request. Another step includes accepting specification of a new application. Yet another step includes calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. The method further includes calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application, based on the calculated current data and information about the obtained access request. Yet another step includes outputting the calculated estimated amount data. The prior art does not teach or suggest all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Krum or Sekimia, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Krum teaches a method for processing requests to service computational tasks. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Krum of the control method of an information processing system as recited in claim 7 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating a current amount of data accessed from each of the applications to the storage, in case of addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 42-49 Krum describes a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, a current amount of data is calculated. The claimed current amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose the step of calculating a current amount of data, as claimed.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19, Krum discloses a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, an estimated amount of data accessed from each of the applications to the storage, in case of addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request is calculated.

The claimed step of calculating an estimated amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose calculating an estimated amount of data, as claimed.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application, based on the calculated current data and information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, and as described in column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19, Krum discloses a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. To the contrary, in the present invention, an estimated amount of data in case of addition of the new application based on the calculated current load data and information about the obtained access request is calculated. The claimed step of calculating an estimated amount of data is quite different from the amount of computer resources being used in Krum. As such, Krum does not disclose calculating an estimated amount of data, as claimed.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes outputting the calculated estimated amount data. Krum does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Krum for teaching this feature.

Therefore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "calculating current amount of data accessed from each of said applications to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as

recited in claim 7.

Furthermore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "calculating estimated amount of data accessed from each of said applications to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 7.

Further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "calculating estimated amount of data in case of addition of said new application based on said calculated current data and information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 7.

Even further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "outputting said calculated estimated amount of data" as recited in claim 7.

The above noted deficiencies of Krum are not supplied by any of the other references of record, namely Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, combining the teachings of Krum and Sekijima in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

As previously discussed, Sekijima teaches a service processing apparatus and a service execution control method. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sekijima of the of the control method of an information processing system as recited in claim 7 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating a current amount of data accessed from each of the applications to the storage, in case of addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching calculating current data.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching calculating estimated data.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application, based on the calculated current data and information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching calculating estimated data.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 7, includes outputting the calculated estimated amount data. Sekijima does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 53-59, Sekijima merely discloses where server load status may be displayed. This is not the same as outputting an estimated amount of data, as in the present invention. More specifically, the server load status of Sekijima, which is an indication of the amount of server resources used, is not the same as a calculated estimated amount of data, as claimed.

Therefore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "calculating current amount of data accessed from each of said applications to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 7.

Furthermore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "calculating estimated amount of data accessed from each of said applications to said storage, in case of

addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 7.

Further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "calculating estimated amount of data in case of addition of said new application based on said calculated current data and information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 7.

Even further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "outputting said calculated estimated amount of data" as recited in claim 7.

Claims 9 and 10

The present invention, as recited in claim 9, provides a program for calculating load data in an information processing system apparatus that is used to operate a plurality of application to request data input to or data output from a storage and a management host that manages the storage. The program includes means for monitoring an access request from the application and obtaining information about the access request for each of the applications. Also included in the program is a means for calculating the current amount of data accessed from the application the storage, based on information about the obtained access request. The program also includes means for accepting specification of a new application. Furthermore, the program includes means for calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. The program also includes means for calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application based on the calculated current amount of data and information about the obtained access request. The program further includes a means for outputting the

calculated estimated amount of data. The prior art does not teach or suggest all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Krum or Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Krum teaches a method for processing requests to service computational tasks. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Krum of the program to calculate load data in an information processing system as recited in claim 9 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating the current amount of data accessed from the application the storage, based on information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19, Krum discloses a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. The computing resource load of Krum is not the same as the current amount of data accessed from the application based on information about the obtained access request, as in the present invention.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on

information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19, Krum discloses a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. The computing resource load of Krum is not the same as the estimated amount of data accessed from the application, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request, as in the present invention.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application based on the calculated current amount of data and information about the obtained access request. Krum does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 42-49 and column 4, lines 8-19, Krum discloses a "computing resource load" that reflects the amount of computing resources that are being used or would be used when a certain set of applications programs are being executed at the same time on a slave computer. The computer resource load may reflect a percentage of the CPU that is being used. The computing resource load of Krum is not the same as the estimated amount of data in case of addition of the new application based on the calculated current amount of data and information about the obtained access request, as in the present invention.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9,

includes a means for outputting the calculated estimated amount of data. Krum does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Krum for teaching outputting calculated estimated data.

Therefore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating current amount of data accessed from said application to said storage based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Furthermore, Krum fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating estimated amount of data accessed from said application to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Even further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating estimated amount of data in case of addition of said new application based on said calculated current amount of data and information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Still even further, Krum fails to teach or suggest "means for outputting said calculated estimated amount of data" as recited in claim 9.

The above noted deficiencies of Krum are not supplied by any of the other references of record, namely Sekijima, whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, combining the teachings of Krum and Sekijima in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

As previously discussed, Sekijima teaches a service processing apparatus and a service execution control method. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in claim 9 of the program to calculate load data in an information

processing system as recited in claim 9 of the present invention.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating the current amount of data accessed from the application the storage, based on information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching a means for calculating current data.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating an estimated amount of data accessed from the application to the storage, in the event of the addition of the new application based on information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching means for calculating estimated data.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for calculating an estimated amount of data in the event of the addition of the new application based on the calculated current amount of data and information about the obtained access request. Sekijima does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner does not rely upon Sekijima for teaching means for calculating estimated data.

Still yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 9, includes a means for outputting the calculated estimated amount of data. Sekijima does not disclose this feature. For example, as described in column 3, lines 53-59, Sekijima merely discloses where server load status may be displayed. This is not the same as outputting an estimated amount of data, as in the present invention. More specifically, the server load status of Sekijima, which is an indication of the

amount of server resources used, is not the same as a calculated estimated amount of data, as claimed.

Therefore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating current amount of data accessed from said application to said storage based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Furthermore, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating estimated amount of data accessed from said application to said storage, in case of addition of said new application based on information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Even further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "means for calculating estimated amount of data in case of addition of said new application based on said calculated current amount of data and information about said obtained access request" as recited in claim 9.

Still even further, Sekijima fails to teach or suggest "means for outputting said calculated estimated amount of data" as recited in claim 9.

Both Krum and Sekijima suffer from the same deficiencies, relative to the features of the present invention, as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Krum and Sekijima in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 as being unpatentable over Krum in view of Sekijima are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the

references used in the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 1213.43685X00).

Respectfully submitted,
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/cmd
(703) 684-1120